

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-11 are pending. Claims 1-7 have been amended. The amended claims are fully supported by the specification starting at page 1. No new matter has been introduced.

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 over Watson (U.S. Pat. No. 6,226,624).

Claim 1 substantively recites in part “a settlement apparatus, said settlement apparatus configured to derive securities data ..., said settlement apparatus further configured to select each of the securities data ..., and said settlement apparatus further configured to store the selected securities data.... .” In other words, claim 1’s settlement apparatus derives, settles, and stores **all in one place**, namely, the recited “settlement apparatus.” By comparison, Watson’s “settle account phase” occurs in different places: the “authorizing agent issues a settlement request to card issuer....”; the “card issuer issues payment settlement response to acquiring bank....”; and the “card issuer issue a billing account to account manager...” at col. 11, lines 15-50. Thus, Watson does not disclose “a settlement apparatus, said settlement apparatus configured to derive securities data ..., said settlement apparatus further configured to select each of the securities data ..., and said settlement apparatus further configured to store the selected securities data.... .”

The storage recited in claim 1 includes the value of securities held by the security company. Watson does not teach or suggest securities or security companies, at Fig. 2A-B, 6A-B, and 8A-B and at col. 9 line 66 through col. 10 line 4. The recited storage includes “a coefficient for calculating the value of each of the securities, in relation to each other.... .” The coefficient relates to the value of the securities held by the securities company. Watson describes a variance as “an acceptable variance, or deviation range from the quotation amount... .” at col. 10, lines 1-3 and “a variance or deviation from the quote amount, such as in the case permitting the inclusion of sales tax with the quoted transaction amount.... .” at col. 10, lines 10-12. Watson’s variance concerns the amount of the transaction, at Fig. 3, and not the recited “coefficient for calculating the value of each of the securities, in relation to each other.... .” Thus, the coefficient as recited in claim 1 is not disclosed by Watson.

Appl. No. 09/895,858
Amdt. sent August 17, 2006
Reply to Office Action of April 24, 2006

PATENT

Independent claims 6 and 7 contain similar limitations and should be allowed by the same rationale set forth above.

For any of the foregoing reasons, the §102 rejections of the claims are believed to be overcome.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



George B. Yee
Reg. No. 37,478

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
GBFY:BCS
60800468 v1